

**ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY, INFRASTRUCTURE AND MAINTENANCE
(ACIM) WORKING GROUP
Perot Systems — 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM
11 December 2003**

MEETING SUMMARY

ACTION: The agenda for the following meetings will be posted on the Internet and distributed to all working group members at least one week prior to the meeting. Nathalie Ward stated that she will e-mail support materials to members for discussion a week prior to each meeting.

ACTION: The WG requested that Lori Arguelles, Executive director of the NMSF, and Mary Enstrom, NMSP National Volunteer Coordinator, speak at the 21 Jan meeting.

ACTION: During the next meeting time will be reserved for each of the staff specialists to present an overview of their programs and products (perhaps a half hour per person) and offer an opportunity to address areas where there are holes in coverage. Nathalie Ward will contact staff members and inform them as to their tasks.

ACTION: Nathalie Ward will obtain a list of penalty schedules, authorities and enforceable regulations that pertain to the sanctuary.

ACTION: Craig MacDonald will obtain a report on OLE/MEP manpower use for last year for review at the next meeting.

ACTION: Susan Dowds and Dan Morast will check with other sanctuaries regarding Friends Groups, and other means to secure additional funds (e.g., user fees, grants)

ACTION: The schedule for ADMIN WG meetings is as follows:

January 21	Volunteer Program; NMSF, staff reports
March 4	tba
April 29	tba

ACTION: Alternates name for WG members must be sent to Nathalie Ward by Dec. 19.

ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY, INFRASTRUCTURE AND MAINTENANCE WG

Working Group Attendees

NAME	WG SEAT and AFFILIATION
Dick Wheeler	Chair: SAC
Nathalie Ward	Team Lead: SBNMS
Dan Morast	Conservation (IWC)
Maggie Geist	Conservation (APCC)
David Clapp	Conservation (MAud))
Stephanie Murphy	Education/Research (WHOI)
John Bullard	Education/Research (SEA)
Steve Tucker	Government (CCC)
Susan Dowd	Museums/Aquariums (NEAq)
Lisa Reed	Museums/Aquariums (NEAq)
David Bergeron	Business (MFP)

Working Group Members Not Present

Greg Ketchan
Robin Peach

Business (GCDC)
Government (MET)

Others Present

Anne Smrcina (rapporteur)
Craig MacDonald

SBNMS
SBNMS Superintendent

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ADOPTION OF ADGENDA, AND COMPENDIUM

Dick Wheeler, ADMIN Chair, and Craig MacDonald, SBNMS Superintendent, welcomed the ADMIN WG and thanked them for their support in the MPR process. Nathalie Ward , ADMIN Team Lead, reviewed the meeting Agenda and the ADMIN Compendium.

SBNMS WORKING GROUP PROCESS

Nathalie Ward provided a summary of the Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary (SBNMS) working group (WG) process in relation to the National Marine Sanctuary Program's (NMSP) Management Plan Review (MPR). Ward reviewed the working group process and the roles of the working group members. She explained there are 13 National Marine Sanctuaries; and, emphasized that SBNMS is tasked with its primary goal of resource protection, and its secondary goal of compatible use, wherein those uses do not conflict with the primary goal.

The National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP) mandates a MPR every five years to develop a Management Plan that guides the objectives, policies and activities of the sanctuary. The Stellwagen Bank's Sanctuary Advisor Council (SAC) provides advice to the Superintendent regarding the MPR, and is made up of 21 members representing various stakeholder groups, citizen's at-large, and federal and state partners (15 voting members)

The initiation of the MPR began in 2002 with 1) a public scoping process, wherein public comments were gathered regarding issues of concern; 2) the comments were categorized by SBNMS staff and presented to the SAC (see Terms of Reference document, "Summary of Scoping Comments"; and, 3) the SAC prioritized the "scoped" issues and suggested the formation of 12 working groups.

The working groups of the SAC review the scoped issues, attending to the question if they are real and/or perceived problems, provide input concerning any additional issues, and then develop an issue-specific Action Plan (AP). The AP is an in-depth characterization and evaluation of the issues with specific recommendations to address issues and implement strategies. Next the ADMIN AP is given to the SAC for review and comment; the SAC provides recommendations to the Superintendent. The SBNMS staff prepares the Draft Management Plan (DMP) that is open to a public review process. The public's comments are incorporated, given to the SAC with final comments, and provided to the Superintendent for final review with a resulting Final Management Plan (FMP). This process is scheduled for completion in 2005.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE WORKING GROUP

Ward discussed working group formation and various WG roles

- *Members* were chosen from over 400 nominations representing @ 190 individuals on 12 WGs. Working group members represent constituents, and in that capacity serve as conduits for an information exchange from their constituents to WG discussions.
- The *Working Group* is made up of a diverse group of individuals chosen because of their ability to respect diverse points of view, and their knowledge of regional marine resources and management issues.
- The *Team Lead's* (SBNMS staff) role is to work closely with the Chair to guide an equitable process and to serve as logistical support including providing background material, agenda, minutes, etc. She/he participates in the process as a stakeholder providing advice on the NMSP's position, views and policies.
- The *Chair*, a member of the SAC, is the meeting administrator and facilitator. The Chair solicits the interests and concerns of the WG, assures that all voices are heard, and guides the fairness of the WG process. If the Chair has an interest that has not been voiced through another member, the Chair must recuse himself from her position as Chair before speaking to her particular interest.
- The *Public* is invited to participate as observers. but they must convey their concerns through one of the members of the working group, not directly to the entire group.
- *Alternates* for members can be appointed. Appointment of Alternates is a decision for the WG.
- *Technical Advisors* are individuals with expertise related to the priority issues. Advisors are encouraged to make recommendations and participate in discussions but shall not participate in WG decisions.

DECISION MAKING

- The WG will strive to reach decisions as a group by general agreement. In cases of dissent a straw man poll will be used to assess group inclinations. If unable to support agreement, a member must demonstrate the importance of that issue and provide written rationale for subsequent recommendation. A definitive record must be kept of all recommendations of the WG.
- In the event of significant disagreements, the WG will work in consultation with a facilitator.

ACTION: The agenda for the following meetings will be posted on the Internet and distributed to all working group members at least one week prior to the meeting. Nathalie Ward will e-mail support materials to members for discussion prior to upcoming meetings.

COMPENDIUM

Ward provided members with an ADMIN Compendium (notebook binder) that contains:

- *Terms of Reference* document which includes:
 - a general outline of the MPR policies and WG purposes;
 - a summary of the scoping documents; the problem statements for all working groups;
 - the National Marine Sanctuary Act; and,
 - MPR Talking Points (generic communication talking points such as what is a National Marine Sanctuary, how it was established, etc.).
- *Agendas, Minutes, Participants Address List*
- *Reference Materials:* Issues of Concern including Administrative Capacity, Infrastructure and Maintenance

ISSUES OF CONCERN: ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY, INFRASTRUCTURE AND MAINTENANCE

Public scoping comments and staff-generated problem statements were reviewed. WG members expressed the sentiment that the sanctuary should future vision and a stated goal from which the working group can develop specific action plans. Craig MacDonald noted that the sanctuary has a broad mission statement that guides activities.

Site Staffing (MacDonald)

QUESTION: Will this process be repeated in 5 or 10 years?

Answer: We are not sure at this time.

QUESTION: What are staffing levels and budget at this time?

Answer: There are six full time federal positions at the sanctuary and six contract positions (4 of which are part-time positions). Craig MacDonald provided an overview of sanctuary staffing and budget. Non-NOAA staff is hired through a personnel agency, through cooperative agreements with nonprofits, and retained through contracts for products.

QUESTION: How long has the administrative support position been open?

Answer: 5 months

QUESTION: How do we compare to other sanctuaries?

Answer: The Channel Islands is of comparable size but has 5 more staff; the larger sites like Florida Keys and Monterey Bay have at least 15 more. Although we are considered moderate in size, SBNMS constitutes a site with many major issues of national importance. The national program recognizes that fact in that we have a Superintendent, rather than a Manager (other sites with superintendents are: Florida Keys, Monterey Bay, Olympic Coast).

QUESTION: Are job functions similar across the sites?

Answer. Yes, each site has an education coordinator, research coordinator, and more recently the position of marine archaeologist (where appropriate; additional funding has come to us from headquarters for that position), boat captain, and SAC Coordinator. Many of these required positions are not supported with federal positions (FTEs).

QUESTION: How many sites have volunteer coordinators and fundraising/grant writing positions?

Answer: Some of the larger sites have a volunteer coordinator and have large and active friends groups that raise money. We do have the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF) which has a SB fund; they are increasingly successful in raising money, but the monies raised do not necessarily come back to SBNMS. A local Friends Group could be the best solution, but it is believed that monies would be managed by the NMSF. If \$ amounts get larger, we are not sure how much control the sanctuary would have over the local money when \$ amounts get larger. There is an MOU between the NMSF and NMSP that establishes linkages and structure (similar to NF&WF and NP&CF)

QUESTION: Is there any funding mechanism now that can go through a nonprofit that would be managed by that NGO?

Answer: We're not sure. There could be a problem from a donor's point of view. Are the \$'s going where you want it to go or being spread around the system. Mention was made of the Citizens for the Protection of Waquoit Bay—the official friends group of WBNERR (this group is not as powerful as needed, but is still a great resource). It was suggested that the WG check with them to find out how they operate.

MacDonald reported staff needs as follows: Education specialists (1-2), science specialists (1-2), operations assistant, volunteer coordinator, media coordinator; national program is looking to elevate SAC coordinator and marine archaeologist to FTE staff positions.

ACTION: The WG requested that Lori Arguelles, Executive director of the NMSF and Mary Enstrom, NMSP National Volunteer Coordinator speak at the next meeting. Nathalie Ward will attempt to secure these two speakers.

Funding Sources (MacDonald)

Conventional:

ORF (the site's base budget)—program money (pays for staff, programs, maintenance) has certain set categories. There are no new programs unless you get additional funds or an old program is discontinued and a new one initiated. SB has had incremental increases to our budget over the past few years. Essentially level funded (with one big increase between 1999 and 2000).

Maintenance costs are going to go up now that we have this large facility. These additional funds will have to come out of base funding. Under the base funding transfers category is the funding that goes for the NMFS OLE (Office of Law Enforcement) agent -- salary, training, travel, other expenses.

National Program Priorities (NPP):

These are additional funds (usually a one-time basis) that support these types of projects at the sites; control held by national program.

PAC funds:

This is a capital fund for construction and acquisition of capital goods (separate category); it can carry over between years because projects may continue over several years, such as the building renovation (\$1.4M) (USCG transfer in 2000). The national program has been asking for \$10M each year. Out of those \$s comes money for exhibits including components and construction. Congress has agreed to have NMSs acquire Class 1 vessels under this funding mechanism.

This past year's PAC \$s also went to NEAq for a refit of some of the cold water tanks into a SBNMS wing. Request s for '04 funds include \$ for a Gloucester visitor center, boathouse renovation for research and education facility, finger pier repair, purchase of open lot for parking. '03 funding has renovated main building for the sanctuary's administrative facility, garage is now a state-of-the-art conference center. '05 money would be for boathouse renovations, pier reconfiguration and a new Provincetown exhibit.

Special Use Permits:

The program can issue permits providing \$ go to managing or monitoring the action. For example, the fiber optic cable—the company had to pay for monitoring the cable and looking at consequences of seafloor disturbance. The monitoring was tied into long-term research project. Payments were interrupted when the company went bankrupt. The cable was bought by a new company, and now payments still being made at a reduced amount. This agreement is for 10 years and will be revisited.

MPR funding:

A National Program Priority for this year has been held up due to the Continuing Resolution. Maritime Archeology—12 of 15 anomalies found on USGS map that were investigated in the past year were shipwrecks. Need to develop resource management plan as historic research and NOAA hang maps indicate that there may be more than 100 sites. Also working with AUSS (John Fish and Arnie Carr).

Monitoring programs:

- *Seafloor Habitat Recovery:* Program conducted in conjunction with special use permit and overlap with WGOM closure (fished vs unfished areas) demonstrates very slow recovery (database mgmt with Perot, UConn, NURC, Brown, UMe, James Lindholm).
- *Marine Mammal Distribution:* 20 year data sett (1979-2000) shows variation year-to-year and within sanctuary but three areas have consistent numbers, correlation with sand lance, spatial analysis, time (perhaps with North Atlantic oscillation). SB wants to expand that time series.

- *WQ monitoring*: Sparked by MWRA outfall baseline data: farfield sites in sanctuary; sanctuary funding covers 4 more sites in sanctuary (extension of Battelle contract with MWRA by SBNMS). Habitat Alteration WG noted the importance of monitoring the rare event.
- *Habitat Use Assessment*: Dave Wiley's extension of IWC work in 1995, 2000/2001 research survey noting anything at sea surface including gear, boats, species (no birds in recent surveys); 2000/1 data sets will be used to build GIS data sets for MPR.
- *Fish tagging*: Research relates to fish movement related to sea floor features by using radio tags implanted in fish. Surprising rate of site loyalty (i.e., fish tagged in one year seen the next).

ACTION: Request that staff specialists present an overview of their programs and products (perhaps a half hour per person) and offer an opportunity to address areas where there are gaps. Nathalie Ward will contact staff members for next meeting.

QUESTION: What are the ways we can raise money? What are government restrictions in fundraising? What are limitations in staffing? Can private monies be used for capital purposes, operations, research, protection? Which of those things would a friends group be able to take on?

Answer: Friends group can underwrite their own budget and take on many different tasks. Should have Lori Aguelles explain capabilities of NMSF.

QUESTION: How do you set up a friends group?

Answer: Look to other organizations for guidance -- Buzzards Bay Project, Coalition for Buzzards Bay; National Parks. How can we leverage our money with ngos, to enhance efforts and not compete (also enhance capabilities of other organizations by teaming)

QUESTION: How do you build a friends group that is not competitive?

No answer

QUESTION: Do you need a friends group?

No answer at this time.

Facilities maintenance:

Comes out of base budget; some PAC money for construction funds; can request emergency \$ out of PAC or otherwise petition for increases to NPP or base. Routine maintenance now comes out of base funds and competes with program funds. The improved plant will get greater use, and utility costs will go up (at HQ 10% of PAC set aside for emergency). Licensing with tenants now being resolved (e.g., MEP now stationed at Scituate —5 members, some of their work is on sanctuary programs. Can cost be offset or swap services? The south shore regional office of MCZM is also in Scituate. Must make decisions about use of meeting rooms (e.g., Scituate water resources board now uses conference room, other town requests may come in soon. Should non-sanctuary users get it at cost? Should it be a public service and free?

ADMIN MINUTES: 12/11/03

- *Vehicles* -- 3 leased, 2 owned. Costs come out of fixed costs in base budget.
- *Vessels* -- HAWK is being surplus and going to East Carolina State University. Obtaining 41-foot USCG vessel temporarily, which is good for enforcement but not a good boat for research; it is quicker than HAWK for VIP trips and observations. We have a 25-foot “go fast” boat (CCS vessel) which is good for marine mammal observations and diving but not good for rough weather. Our 21-foot “Outrage” may go to NMFS. National vessel plan requires workhorse boat for research and education and a “go fast” boat; we pay for captain; fuel paid by NOAA.

Enforcement:

NMFS/OLE (cross-deputized MEP to have authority for NOAA regulations and agreement to have sanctuary included in coverage area. OLE, MEP and USCG enforce sanctuary regs (not that many), but regional/national regs are enforced by fisheries, MMPA, ESA, CWA, MSA, etc. and earn increased penalties in sanctuaries. SBNMS takes advantage of all other federal laws to protect resources (e.g., seabird protection —migratory species with FWS; whale harassment/strike under MMPA, ESA etc.). Questions exist: Should whale watch guidelines become regulations? These are the questions for MMBD WG. In the absence of other regs, it is dependent on the sanctuary to protect its resources.

QUESTION: Would separating the enforcement function away from the sanctuary place the onus elsewhere and save the sanctuary money?

No answer.

QUESTION: Enforcement merits more discussion, if you can't enforce your regs, what is the point in creating regulations in the first place? Why should we pay for the enforcement of national/regional laws which are under another agency's authority? \$130K is a concern -- 4x education budget, is this money well spent?

Answer: None.

QUESTION: Has the sanctuary tried to get NMFS to develop an MOU to take on sanctuary enforcement?

Answer: Tried but we were not able to get it. Underlying authority of NMSA is from 1972, which predates the Magnuson Act. Enforcement authorities were not a part of the underlying sanctuary legislation.

ACTION: Nathalie Ward will obtain a list of penalty schedules, authorities and enforceable regulations that pertain to the sanctuary.

Interpretive Enforcement:

The sanctuary has conducted interpretive enforcement with MEP, OLE and IWC. An example is the “See a Spout” campaign. Cooperative enforcement agreement and contract with MEP was built off of the OLE agreement. A certain amount of the NMFS grant goes for sanctuary patrols (pilot project). Instead of putting \$s to get overtime hours, should we just hire the MA Environmental Police outright to provide regular sanctuary patrols.

ADMIN MINUTES: 12/11/03

ACTION: Craig MacDonald will obtain a report on OLE/MEP manpower use for last year for review at the next meeting.

MOU with USGS (Auxiliary) was developed several years ago—Operation Cetacean Shield. This had problems as an effective enforcement program but may serve better as a reporting mechanism for auxiliarists to OLE, MEP or the USCG/Auxiliary command.

QUESTION: What is the effect of the Boston shipping lane across the sanctuary?

Answer: Mandatory ship reporting system covers the sanctuary, which is part of the right whale reporting area. The shipping lanes are not necessarily used all the time; reports from the field show that the vessels are coming in from various directions.

Community Policing:

Just being out there is one step in getting compliance. Our goal is “How can we get compliance?”

Partnerships (MacDonald)

Sanctuary exhibits are a good example of partnerships. The NMSP is interested in getting exhibits and visitor centers in Gateway Ports. Boston is our #1 site; Provincetown and Gloucester follow. Additional ports are Plymouth and Salem. We need to let people take virtual tours without having to get out onto the water.

The sanctuary doesn't have the funding to build visitor centers from scratch, and therefore relies on partnerships such as NE Aquarium, Center for Coastal Studies, possibly the Gloucester Maritime Heritage Center, Scituate Maritime Museum. NMSP is looking to produce stand-alone kiosks for the sites (e.g., weather kiosks piloted in Channel Islands). Even these kiosks require a partner organization to oversee the unit (for protection, restocking literature, maintenance). The sanctuary would prefer to get space and service free, but will consider finding \$ in our budget. We believe the Cape Cod National Seashore is willing to team with us at the Provincelands.

NMSP has an MOU with NURP (NURC at UConn)—one of the sanctuary's primary research partners, and the source of much of our shiptime. The sanctuary also receives shiptime on NOAA vessels (apply for the time).

COMMENT: The sanctuary is one of largest visitor attractions in NE. The NEAq and Museum of Science are just a bit more popular with about 1.5million visitors. User fees may create conflicts with the sanctuary and between user groups. But the fact of the high visitation to the sanctuary is not a well known fact and could be capitalized upon and therein used to the sanctuary's benefit.

Issues at sites. (MacDonald)

Annual planning process often does not meet full expectations, due to limitations of staff time and slippage due to requirements from HQ that were not expected. Staff must develop strategies to deal with crises and contingencies that are beyond our control.

Review of Problem Statements (Ward)

After a review of problem statements, the WG decided that more information was needed to ascertain if the public's comments were real or perceived.

ADMIN Working Group Queries and Comments

- Does the sanctuary want to significantly advance a particular idea; rather than a little bit of everything else (e.g., of all the science topics, perhaps we focus on the evaluation of fisheries habitat)?
- What are the specifics of setting up a Friend's Group? How do we set it up so that it is noncompetitive with other nonprofits? What audience are we targeting? What do we provide that is worth their member dollar? How do we launch it? Do we establish a founders group? How do we achieve buy in?
- Would a SBNMS volunteer group be unique—what is out there in the GOM?
- What is the sanctuary's ability to raise outside funds from corporate sponsors, other foundations? How do we make the case to the foundation?
- A major problem in partnerships in a volunteer network is getting competent long-term workers: How to best achieve this goal?
- Branding is a signature issue. It is critical to put the money where it will do the most good. What are those areas?
- SBNMS WGs are focusing on the sanctuary's specific interests. Whatever the other working groups decide, there will be financial needs associated, perhaps more than the sanctuary can provide.
- What NE needs is a broader understanding of the GOM volunteer groups.
- Separate out the things you are going to do directly versus what you will partner on.
- Develop a list of SB attributes of SB and potential partnerships. If you are clear on specific value, then you can focus on fundraising and other tasks.
- Come up with specific recommendations for sanctuary (e.g., need to write more grants, need to develop a friends group, develop a broader vision)
- Get \$ from base budget for basic protection, research, education but outside support for GOM education ; there's a strategy for getting \$ for education programs.
- Setting standards might be an attractive program for foundation support that can be transported to other areas/cities.

MacDonald noted that the ADMIN WG is a “how to” group as opposed to “what is” group—How can we be more efficient? How to leverage resources? How do we get more money? How do we allocate funds (spread over many areas or concentrate in only a few)? MacDonald emphasized that the ADMIN working group should not build the sanctuary programs (the whats

ADMIN MINUTES: 12/11/03

will come out in the other working groups), but should focus on the “hows” — the mechanisms— for building programs.

He stated that some items coming in to this committee will be top priorities of other WGs. How do we find the resources to support these efforts? (For example, logo licensing; partnerships with groups that can send in collaborative science research grants that the sanctuary cannot submit.) MacDonald asked, *How can we learn from your collective knowledge to build our capacity?*

Possible Actions Plans/Strategies

- One solution would be to have 13 individuals on the NMSF staff, each assigned to a specific sanctuary to raise funds at the site; key to have someone on site;
- Tap into NSF supplement grants for education and outreach;
- Get a list of research projects that need to be done and send to the research institutions in the area;
- Develop a certification system that can develop a new revenue stream such as dive operations on a specific wreck in the sanctuary that is licensed only to a certain dive operation (the essence of their business plan). The sanctuary then controls use of the resource and the company gains value from the resource;
- Let the participants pay for the use of the resource (e.g., whale watch certification fee that would provide value to sanctuary, but the whale watch company would be able to advertise that each ticket is supporting the NMS)

ACTION: Susan Dowds and Dan Morast will check with other sanctuaries as to what they have for friends groups, and what are they doing for additional funds (e.g., user fees, grants).

COMMENTS:

- Have someone come in to talk about licensing and other earned income agreements (perhaps legal advice or someone from another sanctuary);
- Look into the possibility of the sanctuary selling something that provides value to the user group (buying compliance with the licensing so you don't have to pay for enforcement).
- Wreck diving certifications --sanctuary certification program that has a 25cent surcharge per passenger that you can advertise you are certified-- the certification would provide value to the company as well as the sanctuary
- Issues of whalewatch companies wanting to make money, but they don't want to serve any other function.
- The sanctuary can help draw the people who go out on the boats -- help the industry by building the audience

ADMIN MINUTES: 12/11/03

SUMMARY and NEXT STEPS

ACTION: The schedule for WG meetings is as follows:

January 21	Volunteer Program; NMSF, staff reports (science and education)
March 4	TBA
April 29	TBA

ACTION: Agreement to have alternates, name must be sent to Nathalie Ward by Dec. 19.

ADMIN WG GOAL STATEMENT:

To propose a prioritized resource development strategy aimed at growing capacity to implement the goals and objectives of the working groups.

Dick Wheeler presented a summary of the issues and adjourned the meeting.

Administrative Capacity, Infrastructure and Maintenance Working Group

AGENDA

11 December 2003 TPMC—Scituate, MA
9:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

- 9:00 – 9:30 Welcome, Introductions and Adoption of Agenda
- 9:30 – 10:30 Working Group Process (SBNMS)
Ground Rules
- 10:30 – 12:00 ADMIN Issues of Concern: Problem Statements
7.A: Base Level Staffing and Program Support
 Site Staffing
 Funding Sources
 Partnerships and Volunteer Groups
 Performance Measures
7.B: Infrastructure Development and Maintenance
 Facilities, Vessels and Vehicles
 Funding
 Performance Measures
- 12:00 – 12:30 *Lunch*
- 12:30 – 1:00 Current SBNMS Staffing: Discussion
- 1:00 – 1:30 SBNMS Funding Sources and Mechanisms of Income: Discussion
- 1:30 – 2:00 Enforcement Needs and Arrangements: Discussion
- 2:00 – 2:30 Partnerships and Volunteer Networks: Discussion
- 2:30 *Coffee Break*
- 2:45 – 3:15 Facilities, Vehicles and Vessels: Discussion
- 3:15 – 3:45 W.G. Logistics (Meeting Dates, Technical Advisors)
- 3:45 – 4:00 Next Steps and Summary
- 4:00 Adjourn